REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the same and have amended the S and O content from ppm to % for consistency. No new matter is involved.

Initially, Claim 1-3 were rejected under judicially created nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application Serial No. 10/519,673. A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed herewith that should remove this rejection.

Further, the Examiner's attention is drawn to three related pending applications and the prior art cited therein. These applications are U.S. Serial No. 10/519,672, the above-identified U.S. Serial No. 10/519,673 and U.S. Serial No. 10/519,674. The prior art cited in these related cases is presented in an Information Disclosure Statement filed on even date with this amendment.

Claim 1, as now amended, is to a fluid handling part for use in piping a fluid control device which is composed of a plurality of components, the plurality of components including a bolt or nut having a surface exposed on an exterior of the fluid handling part. In the fluid handling part, only the bolt or nut is made of an alloy comprising, in % by weight, 0.001 to 0.01% of C, up to 5% of Si, up to 2% of Mn, up to 0.03% of P, up to 0.01% of S, up to 0.005% of O, 18 to 25% of Cr, 15 to 25% of Ni, 4.5 to 7.0% of Mo, 0.5 to 3.0% of Cu, 0.1 to 0.3% of N, and the balance substantially Fe and other inevitable impurities; while in Claim 2, the fluid handling part of the specific alloy is bolts in a valve having a body, an actuator, and a diaphragm where the bolts fasten the components together; and in Claim 3, the fluid handling part of the specific alloy is a cap nut in a pipe coupling. Such constructions are not taught or suggested in the prior art.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of a combination of Schieber (U.S. 5,909,747) and Ueda et al. (U.S. 4,883,544), while Claims 1 and 3 are rejected as obvious in view of a combination of Ogawa (U.S. 4,630,851) and Ueda et al. Reconsideration and removal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the present amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

With respect fo Schieber, the Office Action states that Schieber discloses a valve having a fluid handling part for use in piping, with a body (22), an actuator (28), a diaphragm (26), and bolts (88) that hold the components together and has a surface exposed to the exterior of the fluid handling part. It then states that Schieber only lacks the bolts being made of a specific metal. Ueda et al. is cited to teach an austenitic stainless steel for members in contact with seawater. It is then alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the diaphragm valve of Schieber by using bolts made from the steel alloy taught by Ueda et al. in order to avoid corrosion of the bolts.

The same general rejection is made relative to Claims 1 and 3 using the Ogawa-Ueda et al. combination. The Office Action states that Ogawa discloses a pipe coupling, a cap nut (8) that has a surface exposed to an exterior of a fluid handling part, an externally threaded portion (2), and a tubular coupling member (1). It then states that Ogawa only lacks the cap nut being a specified metal. Ueda et al. is again cited to teach an austenitic stainless steel for members in contact with seawater. It is then alleged it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the pipe coupling of Ogawa by using a cap nut made from the steel

alloy taught by Ueda et al. in order to avoid corrosion of the cap nut.

The Ueda reference, while suggesting alloys having excellent corrosion resistance, and excellent workability when the material is hot-worked into a heavy plate, or strip, or the like, the Ueda reference is to a process for reducing an alloy and not any end product. Ueda refers repeatedly to heavy plates, slabs or strips formed by rolling and finishing and does not suggest anything connected with a fluid handling part such as bolts of a valve or a cap nut of a pipe coupling. Why would one combine this general Ueda teaching with Schieber and Ogawa absent first a review of Applicants' specification?

In the present claimed invention, of amended Claim 1, only a bolt or nut having the surface exposed on the exterior of the fluid handling part is made of the specific alloy recited. The same is true in amended Claims 2 and 3, where only specific components having a surface exposed on a surface of the fluid handling part is of the specified metal.

In view of the present amendments to the claims, and the above remarks, Claims 1-3, as amended, are believed to be patentable and early action towards allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/519,675 Amendment filed May 7, 2007 Reply to OA dated January 19, 2007

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,

HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William G. Kratz, Jr. Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 22,631

WGK/jls Atty. Docket No. **040696** Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Q:\FLOATERS\WGK\04\040696\amd 04-24-07 v.1